United Nations A/C.2/61/SR.33

General Assembly
Sixty-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General
10 January 2007

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 33rd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 6 December 2006, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms. Intelmann. . . . . (Estonia)

Contents

Agenda item 51: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(c) External debt crisis and development (*continued*)

(d) Commodities (*continued*)

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

(c) International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (*continued*)

Agenda item 54: Implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (*continued*)

Agenda item 55: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(d) Preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption (*continued*)

Agenda item 56: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

06-64390 (E)

Agenda item 57: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) (*continued*)

Agenda item 59: Training and research (*continued*)

(a) United Nations University (*continued*)

Agenda item 118: Programme planning (*continued*)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

Agenda item 51: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(c) External debt crisis and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L. 6 and L.54)

Draft resolution on the external debt crisis and development

1. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.54, which was being submitted by Ms. Gomes (Portugal), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.6. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Ms. Gomes** (Portugal), Rapporteur, said that, in the first preambular paragraph, the words "external debt crisis and development" should have initial capital letters. In the ninth preambular paragraph, the words "*Welcoming also*" should be replaced by "*Further welcoming*" and the words "Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative" should refer to the following footnote: "Debt relief under the two initiatives is expected to reduce the debt stocks of the 29 HIPCs that have reached the decision point by almost 90 per cent. 'Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative and Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI) — Status of Implementation' prepared by the staffs of IDA and IMF August 2006." In paragraph 8, the word "are" should be replaced by "be".

3. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.54, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

4. **Mr. Gass** (Switzerland), speaking in explanation of position, said that, although his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it had two reservations regarding the title. First, the overall situation and the content of the resolution itself did not warrant the use of the word "crisis". Secondly, any analysis of the impact of a country's debt situation on its development should take into account internal as well as external debt.

5. Finally, while debt reduction initiatives could contribute to making debt levels more sustainable, the goal of such initiatives was not to cancel 100 per cent of debt. Such a measure would only make it more difficult to find balanced long-term solutions to unsustainable debt.

6. **Mr. Rosengren** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Moldova and Ukraine, said that, although the draft resolution contained many positive provisions, the European Union had had difficulty with the use of the word "crisis" in the title. It also had concerns regarding the phrase "cancellation of 100 per cent of the official multilateral and bilateral debt of heavily indebted poor countries" in paragraph 12. The European Union had reluctantly accepted the paragraph because it contained agreed language from General Assembly resolution 60/265 on the follow-up to the development outcome of the 2005 World Summit. The ultimate goal of debt relief was to reduce debt burdens to sustainable levels and the reference to cancellation of 100 per cent of the debt of heavily indebted poor countries was not in line with the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative.

7. **Mr. Mally** (United States of America) said that his delegation had been pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, although it had hoped to also reach consensus on omitting the word "crisis" from the title. By retaining the title "external debt crisis", the text did not recognize the fact that the debt position of developing countries had improved significantly and that the HIPC Initiative and the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative, as well as reforms and economic growth, had eased the crisis situation. When the General Assembly repeated language used the previous year to call for consideration of additional measures, it seemed to be either unaware of or ungrateful for the measures that were already in place, including bilateral efforts. It was to be hoped that, at the sixty-second session, the Committee would adopt a text more relevant to the actual situation existing at the time.

8. Finally, in paragraph 12, the word "eligible" should have been inserted in front of "heavily indebted poor countries". In that respect, eligibility requirements were carefully negotiated to ensure that heavily indebted poor countries avoided further unsustainable borrowing and followed other good fiscal management policies.

9. **Mr. Fautua** (New Zealand), speaking on behalf of the CANZ group of countries (Australia, Canada and New Zealand), said that the draft resolution articulated

the effort made to help heavily indebted poor countries to improve their unsustainable debt positions. However, throughout the negotiations, the CANZ group had voiced concern regarding the phrase "cancellation of 100 per cent of the multilateral and bilateral debt" in paragraph 12. In a spirit of compromise, it had accepted the facilitator's proposal to use the language of General Assembly resolution 60/265. However, that language did not reflect the reality of the HIPC Initiative and the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative. Neither initiative ensured 100 per cent cancellation and it should be understood that creditors were not mandated to provide such relief.

10. The group also noted that the word "crisis" in the title did not reflect the reality of the current debt situation or the scope of the draft resolution.

11. **Mr. Le Roux** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, stressed that many heavily indebted poor countries were indeed still experiencing a debt crisis. The title would be retained until all developing countries had achieved full debt sustainability.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.6 was withdrawn.*

(d) Commodities (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.7 and L.56)

Draft resolution on commodities

13. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.56, which was being submitted by Ms. Gomes (Portugal), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.7. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

14. **Ms. Gomes** (Portugal), Rapporteur, said that the word "Declaration" in the fifth preambular paragraph should be replaced by the word "outcome". In line 2 of paragraph 12, a comma should be added after "organizations" and the words "and developed countries" should be replaced by the words "by developed countries". The word "also" should be inserted before the word "encourages". In paragraph 20, the phrase "international task force on commodities" should have initial capital letters.

15. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.56, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

16. **Mr. Mally** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation reaffirmed its commitment to the Doha Development Agenda. However, formal resumption of the Doha Round negotiations required Member States to move beyond their current positions, especially in the core negotiations on agriculture, industrial goods and services. The goal of future negotiations was to open markets and achieve further trade liberalization, while recognizing the institutional needs of the developing countries as they integrated into regional and multilateral trade regimes.

17. **Mr. Yun** Kang-hyeon (Republic of Korea) said that his delegation was pleased that a consensus had been reached and that confidence in trade resolutions had been restored.

18. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.7 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.21/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the International Year of Forests, 2011

19. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.21/Rev.1, which was being submitted by Croatia on behalf of the sponsors listed in the document. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

20. **Ms. Zubčević** (Croatia) said that 2011 should be a year for strengthening multi-stakeholder dialogue and policy and programme coordination and promoting public participation.

21. Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia, Burundi, Cambodia, the Central African Republic, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, the Gambia, Georgia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Palau, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, the Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Republic

of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe wished to join the list of sponsors.

22. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.21/Rev.1 was adopted.*

(c) International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.25 and L.58)

Draft resolution on the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction

23. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.58, which was being submitted by Mr. Fonseca (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.25.

24. **Ms. Pliner** (Secretary of the Committee) read out the statement of programme budget implications arising from draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.58, which was also being circulated to the members of the Committee at the meeting.

25. By paragraph 21 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to allocate adequate financial and administrative resources, within existing resources, for the activities and effective functioning of the Inter-Agency Secretariat for the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. The General Assembly, in its resolution 54/219, had established the Secretariat for the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and the Inter-Agency Task Force for Natural Disaster Reduction as successor arrangements for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction. The Secretariat for the Strategy and its activities were exclusively financed from extrabudgetary resources. Therefore, if the General Assembly adopted draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.58, there would be no financial implications for the regular budget.

26. In section VI of resolution 45/248 B, the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

27. **Mr. Fonseca** (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson, said that the text reflected the consensus reached during the informal consultations. He recommended that it should be adopted by consensus.

28. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.58 was adopted.*

29. **Mr. Mansour** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. However, it was of the opinion that highlighting certain categories of natural disasters would be a deviation from the provisions of the Hyogo Framework for Action. The penultimate paragraph of the draft resolution clearly stressed "the need to address risk reduction of and vulnerabilities to all natural hazards, including geological and hydro-meteorological hazards, in a comprehensive manner". It was to be hoped that the Secretariat for the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction would take note of the language used in the draft resolution and that the Secretary-General's next report would address all types of natural hazards and disasters in a comprehensive and balanced manner.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.25 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 54: Implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.17 and L.57)

Draft resolution on the implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and the strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)

31. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.57, which was being submitted by Mr. Fonseca (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.17. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

32. **Mr. Fonseca** (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson, recommended the draft resolution to the Committee and expressed the hope that it would be adopted by consensus.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.57 was adopted.*

34. **Ms. Toro** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Moldova, Norway and Ukraine, said that

the European Union had been pleased to join the consensus, which had been reached with the understanding that the UN-Habitat Governing Council was the decision-making body of the organization and that the draft resolution in question would not prejudge the decisions taken by it.

35. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.57 should not be interpreted as a directive to the Governing Council and therefore did not limit the prerogative of the Council to set its own agenda or to consider the various agenda items as it deemed appropriate.

36. In addition, she drew attention to the fact that paragraphs 1 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.17 had been moved to the preambular part of draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.57 to highlight the fact that the General Assembly had not taken a stand on the documents mentioned in those paragraphs.

37. The European Union looked forward to the six-year medium-term strategic and institutional plan of UN-Habitat and emphasized the crucial role that UN-Habitat could play in the rapid urbanization taking place, especially in developing countries.

38. **Mr. Wood** (Canada) said that he fully supported the Finnish representative's statement.

39. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.17 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 55: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(d) Preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.20 and L.53)

Draft resolution on preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of assets of illicit origin and returning such assets, in particular to the countries of origin, consistent with the United Nations Convention against Corruption

40. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.53, which was being submitted by Mr. Barry (Senegal), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.20. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

41. **Mr. Barry** (Senegal), Vice-Chairperson, recommended the draft resolution to the Committee and expressed the hope that it would be adopted by consensus.

42. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.53 was adopted.*

43. **Ms. Ollus** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Moldova, Norway and Ukraine, said that priority should be given to combating corruption and to the ratification, accession and full implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption by all Member States. The draft resolution would send a strong message with respect to those objectives. In addition, the Conference of the States Parties, to be held in Jordan from 10 to 14 December 2006, would contribute significantly to international efforts to fight corruption.

44. Unfortunately, the title of the resolution did not clearly reflect the provisions of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, particularly chapter V on asset recovery. The European Union also had reservations about the nature, scope and necessity of the report requested of the Secretary-General in paragraph 4, as the resources used to produce such a report could be more effectively employed to provide practical anti-corruption assistance to Member States. For that reason and in order to avoid duplication, when compiling his report for the sixty-second session, the Secretary-General should take full advantage of the information gathered during and as an outcome of the first Conference of States Parties to the Convention against Corruption.

45. **Mr. Le Roux** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, reiterated the importance of combating corruption for those countries and said that the Group of 77 would prepare a comprehensive resolution on the issue for the sixty-second session.

46. **Mr. Wood** (Canada), **Ms. Kirkpatrick** (United States of America) and **Mr. Shimada** (Japan) associated themselves with the Finnish representative's statement.

47. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.20 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 56: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.37 and L.64)

Draft resolution on the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

48. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.64, which was being submitted by Mr. Atiyanto (Indonesia), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.37. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

49. **Mr. Abidin** (Malaysia) proposed that several words should be written with initial capital letters: in the eighth preambular paragraph, "ministerial declaration"; in paragraph 9, "poverty reduction strategy papers"; and in paragraphs 11 and 12, "resident coordinator". He expressed appreciation to all delegations for their flexibility in the negotiations, which would hopefully enable the Committee to adopt the resolution by consensus.

50. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia), Vice-Chairperson, recommended the draft resolution to the Committee and expressed the hope that it would be adopted by consensus.

51. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.64, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

52. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.37 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 57: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.39 and L.63)

Draft resolution on the role of microcredit and microfinance in the eradication of poverty

53. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.63, which was being submitted by Mr. Atiyanto (Indonesia), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.39. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

54. **Ms. Mills** (Jamaica) proposed several corrections to the text: in the second preambular paragraph, the phrase "in particular for the poor", should come before the words "including microfinance and microcredit"; in the sixth preambular paragraph, the words "in particular" should be deleted and the word "especially" should be inserted between the words "have" and "benefited"; and in paragraph 5, the comma following the word "microcredit" should be deleted.

55. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia) Vice-Chairperson, recommended the draft resolution to the Committee and expressed the hope that it would be adopted by consensus.

56. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.63, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

57. **Ms. Fernandez** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Liechtenstein, Moldova and Ukraine, said that microfinance was a very important tool in alleviating poverty and achieving the Millennium Development Goals. The European Union welcomed the increased attention that the granting of the 2006 Nobel Peace Prize to Professor Yunus and the Grameen Bank had given to microfinance throughout the world.

58. The European Union had actively participated in the International Year of Microcredit 2005, one of the benefits of which had been that early discussions based on microcredit had evolved into discussions on microfinance, which comprised a broad range of financial products and services for the poor and for micro and small businesses. It fully supported the activities of the United Nations Advisers Group on Inclusive Financial Sectors. It was commendable that the term "inclusive financial sectors" had been used together with the phrase "microfinance, including microcredit". That was an appropriate development, which should have been reflected in the title of the draft resolution.

59. **Ms. Ruder** (Switzerland) said that she supported the Finnish representative's statement, believing that microfinance tools were crucial to alleviating poverty and achieving the Millennium Development Goals. While Switzerland welcomed the draft resolution, it was disappointed that the language did not sufficiently reflect recent developments in microfinance.

60. **Mr. Wood** (Canada) said that his delegation had been pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, believing that microfinance was an effective and powerful tool for alleviating poverty and reducing the vulnerability of the poor, which in turn enabled them to achieve the Millennium Development Goals sustainably, on their own terms.

61. Canada had participated actively in the United Nations International Year of Microcredit 2005; it had also hosted the Global Microcredit Summit 2006, which highlighted Canada's commitment to microfinance as a tool for development.

62. Microfinance had evolved rapidly in the previous decade by becoming more responsive to low-income individuals' diverse needs for financial products. Canada therefore supported the vision of building inclusive financial sectors for development.

63. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.39 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 59: Training and research (*continued*)

(a) United Nations University (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.36/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the United Nations University

64. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.36/Rev.1, which was being submitted by Mr. Kodera (Japan). The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

65. **Mr. Kodera** (Japan) said that Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, the Gambia, Georgia, Greece, Grenada, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, the Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

66. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.36/Rev.1 was adopted.*

67. **Mr. Kodera** (Japan) expressed appreciation for the active participation and spirit of cooperation of Member States, especially the Group of 77 and China, the European Union, the United States of America, the Russian Federation and other partners, during the informal consultations on the draft resolution. Together with the United Nations system, the University would continue to evolve in response to the rapid changes occurring in the world. To do that successfully, however, it must continue to receive strong support from Member States.

68. He hoped that the draft resolution would attract further attention to the University in United Nations forums and that Member States would take further interest in its activities. The University's New York Office had an important role to play in responding to Members States' interest in seeing issues addressed in the University as well as raising awareness about its work within the United Nations. He urged other delegations to take advantage of the many events hosted by the New York Office and to work together with the University.

Agenda item 118: Programme planning (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.50)

Draft decision on programme planning

69. **The Chairperson** introduced draft decision A/C.2/61/L.50.

70. *Draft decision A/C.2/61/L.50 was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.

United Nations A/C.2/61/SR.34

General Assembly
Sixty-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General
16 January 2007

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 34th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 8 December 2006, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Ms. Intelmann ..... (Estonia)

Contents

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*)

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind (*continued*)

(e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*)

(f) Convention on Biological Diversity (*continued*)

(g) Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its ninth special session (*continued*)

Agenda item 55: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

06-64899 (E)

Agenda item 56: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(b) Specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of landlocked developing countries: outcome of the International Ministerial Conference of Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries and Donor Countries and International financial and Development Institutions on Transit Transport Cooperation (*continued*)

Agenda item 57: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) (*continued*)

(b) Industrial development cooperation (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance of the United Nations, including special economic assistance (*continued*)

(b) Special economic assistance to individual countries or regions (*continued*)

Agenda item 110: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Completion of the main part of the Committee's work

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.27 and L.60)

Draft resolution on implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development

1. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.60, which was being submitted by Mr. Fonseca (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.27. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Fonseca** (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson, in recommending the draft resolution for adoption, suggested that the floor might be given to the facilitator of the informal consultations in order for him to present a few changes that had been made to the text already circulated.

3. **Mr. Mansour** (Islamic Republic of Iran), said that the phrase "in a balanced manner" should be deleted from paragraph 16 and drew attention to a number of minor drafting changes.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.60, as orally revised, was adopted.*

5. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.27 was withdrawn.*

(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.30 and L.67)

Draft resolution entitled "Towards the sustainable development of the Caribbean Sea for present and future generations"

6. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.67, which was being submitted by Mr. Fonseca (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.30. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

7. **Mr. Fonseca** (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson, recommended the draft resolution for adoption with minor drafting changes.

8. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.67 was adopted with minor drafting changes.*

9. **Mr. Uzcategui** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his delegation had participated actively in the discussions of the Association of Caribbean States and other regional forums on the question of recognition of the Caribbean Sea as a Special Area in the context of sustainable development and cooperated in many bilateral and multilateral activities in support of that initiative. While his delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.67, it believed that the reference to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the sixth preambular paragraph should apply only to those States that were a party to that Convention.

10. **Mr. Meurs** (United States of America) said that while his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it questioned the need for the new formulation "special area in the context of sustainable development". There were several mechanisms already in place to protect the Caribbean region, such as the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, various provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, and the Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region. Additionally, while the terms "special area" had particular legal implications under the annexes of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, its use in other areas was not provided for under international law and did not carry legal implications or affect existing law in any way. Proposals for special recognition of the Caribbean Sea in other forums or under particular treaties would have to be decided on the merits.

11. Further, the inclusion in paragraph 5 of "accidental release of hazardous waste" did not necessarily mean that such accidental releases were a "violation of relevant international rules and standards". Accidental releases were violations of international rules only when such rules so provided, if at all.

12. **Ms. Say** (Turkey) said that while her delegation had joined the consensus, it wished to dissociate itself from references in the draft resolution to international instruments to which Turkey was not a party. Those references should not be interpreted as a change in the legal position of Turkey with regard to such instruments.

13. **Mr. Pic** (France), speaking also on behalf of the United Kingdom, said that while welcoming the adoption of the draft resolution, the two countries wished to stress the importance of freedom of navigation through the Caribbean Sea, in accordance with international law. It was important that all sea routes, in particular those between Europe and Asia, should always remain open.

14. Transportation of radioactive materials was organized under strict observance of the relevant international rules, as defined by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the International Maritime Organization. As a result of those rules, no accident involving the maritime carriage of radioactive or nuclear materials had ever occurred. Lastly, a revision of the Brussels Convention relating to Civil Liability in the Field of Maritime Carriage of Nuclear Material and of the Paris Convention on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy would bring an improvement to the compensation system from which the countries of the Caribbean region could benefit, should the need arise.

15. **Mr. Hart** (Barbados), speaking on behalf of the Association of Caribbean States, said that while the proposal to have the Caribbean Sea recognized internationally as a Special Area within the context of sustainable development might represent a different approach from that taken elsewhere in the world, the uniqueness of the Caribbean Sea merited an innovative approach embracing the concerns of all its shoreline States, as well as the international community. As the United Nations and the international community moved towards mainstreaming sustainable development in development planning and strategies, and emphasized country or regional ownership of such strategies, a fresh initiative by a diverse group of developing countries could serve as a useful model.

16. **Mr. Ito** (Japan) said that his delegation fully supported the position of France and the United Kingdom.

17. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.30 was withdrawn.*

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.24/Rev. 1)

Draft resolution on protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind

18. **The Chairperson** drew attention to draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.24/Rev.1, noting that some further revisions had been made to that document. For the time being, such revisions were available in English only.

19. **Ms. Zia** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, noted that after many hours of discussion and negotiation, the Group, finding that consensus was still very distant, had resolved to reintroduce its original text, with revisions, feeling that that was preferable to having the Committee remain silent on such an important issue. The Group of 77 and China had shown extreme flexibility throughout the negotiations and hoped the revised proposal would find support. It was unimaginable that any delegation could vote against the resolution, or abstain, on such a crucial matter.

20. In the tenth preambular paragraph, the words "and *noting* the pending release of the Fourth Assessment report" had been added at the end. She also pointed out that a new paragraph 2 had been added, reading: "*Notes* the commitments, initiatives and processes undertaken within the framework of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, as well as the Kyoto Protocol for those who are parties to it, in order to meet the ultimate objective of the Convention". A new paragraph 4 would read: "*Underlines* that the seriousness of climate change argues for the implementation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change", and in paragraph 6, the words "decisions adopted by" had been replaced by "outcome of". The following new language had been incorporated in paragraph 7, to match language used by certain other conventions: "*Takes note* with appreciation of the outcome of the fourth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, including the pledges made by the international community to the Trust Fund at the Third Assembly of the Global Environment Facility, held in Cape Town, South Africa, in August 2006, and stresses the importance of the fulfilment of the commitments". She expressed regret that the version of the draft

resolution with those revisions was available in English only.

21. **The Chairperson** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

22. **Mr. Fonseca** (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson, expressed appreciation for the efforts of the representative of Croatia and, during her temporary absence, of the representative of Argentina, to achieve consensus.

23. **The Chairperson** said that a recorded vote had been requested on paragraph 10 of A/C.2/61/L.24/Rev.1, as orally revised.

24. **Mr. Ito** (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that global warming was an urgent challenge and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was an important forum for international negotiation and action. However, the latter was an independent treaty body with its own budget and secretariat. Japan had consistently maintained that the United Nations should not be called upon to shoulder the expenses of the Convention secretariat, and that starting with the biennium 2008-2009, it should assume full responsibility for its own conference-servicing costs. Accordingly, Japan had asked for a separate vote on paragraph 10 and would vote against the paragraph. Nevertheless, climate change remained a major priority of the international environmental policy of Japan, which, as the largest donor to the Convention secretariat, would continue to participate actively in the debates on — and work to mitigate — climate change, regardless of the outcome of the vote.

25. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.24/Rev.1, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Japan, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

26. *Paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.24/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 108 votes to 2, with 48 abstentions.*

27. **The Chairperson** informed the Committee that a recorded vote had also been requested on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.24/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised.

28. **Mr. Ainchil** (Argentina) wished to know which delegation had requested the recorded vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

29. **The Chairperson** said that the recorded vote on the draft resolution as a whole had been requested by the European Union.

30. **Ms. Lintonen** (Finland), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, on behalf of the European Union, the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries and potential candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia, and, in addition, Moldova, Norway and Ukraine, expressed regret that it had not been possible to reach consensus. The draft resolution currently before the Committee was not an adequate response by the General Assembly to the serious threat posed by climate change, nor did it reflect the actions that all countries needed to take to tackle it. Consequently, the European Union would abstain.

31. Deeply concerned about the regional and global consequences of climate change, the European Union was determined to continue demonstrating strong leadership through stronger commitments, but it was clear that action by the European Union alone would not be sufficient. The Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change was expected to confirm that the scientific evidence was no longer in doubt: climate change was a man-made challenge requiring an urgent global response. It threatened peace, development and economic prosperity, not in the future, but now.

32. The entry into force and timely implementation of the Kyoto Protocol was a key priority of the European Union, which also stressed the importance of preparing negotiations on a multilateral framework for post-2012 initiatives, with a view to avoiding any interruption in dealing with climate change.

33. The European Union was actively supporting developing countries in their efforts to counter adverse effects of climate change and, in that connection, endorsed the guiding principles, modalities and governance structure of the Adaptation Fund.

34. **Mr. Bialek** (Australia), speaking on behalf of the CANZ group of countries (Australia, Canada and New Zealand), expressed disappointment at the way in which the draft resolution had been negotiated and submitted. The CANZ countries had indicated their support for a minimalist text and been generally comfortable with the substance of the text. However, the decision to end negotiations early had been unfortunate. Climate change was one of the greatest challenges currently facing the global community. Consensus-based, multilateral approaches were the only way to develop effective international policy responses. The manner in which the draft resolution had been negotiated and submitted was not conducive to promoting cooperative and informed debate on such a critical issue. The CANZ countries would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, as orally revised.

35. *A recorded vote was held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.24/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic,

Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

36. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.24/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 114 votes to 0, with 49 abstentions.**

37. **Mr. Maksimychev** (Russian Federation) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution but also expressed concern regarding the process by which agreement had been reached. Such an important draft resolution should be negotiated openly and transparently, and adopted by consensus. The failure of that process had resulted in the very unfortunate situation of having to proceed to a recorded vote. Furthermore, in violation of accepted practice and rules, the Committee had had to adopt the draft resolution before it had been translated into all official languages. His delegation considered that practice to be unacceptable and had agreed to it on an exceptional basis and only because it had been placed in that unacceptable situation.

38. **Mr. Pic** (France) also expressed concern that the Committee had had to adopt the draft resolution before it had been translated into all official languages. He hoped that such a situation would not arise again.

(e) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.31 and L.55)

Draft resolution on the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa

39. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.55, which was being submitted by Mr. Fonseca (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.31.

40. **Ms. Pliner** (Secretary of the Committee) read out the statement of programme budget implications arising from draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.55, which was also being circulated to the members of the Committee at the meeting.

41. With regard to paragraph 8, it was recalled that, in accordance with the general principles on the administrative arrangements for the Permanent Secretariat of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, contained in the note by the Secretary-General (A/AC.241/44), the United Nations Secretariat provided administrative and other support to the secretariat of the Convention on a reimbursable basis subject to General Assembly approval.

42. It was also recalled that the General Assembly, by its resolution 60/201, and further to its resolutions 52/198 and 56/196 on institutional linkage and related administrative arrangements between the United Nations Secretariat and the Convention secretariat, had approved the continuation of the current institutional linkage and related administrative arrangements for a further five-year period, to be reviewed by both the General Assembly and the Conference of the Parties not later than 31 December 2011.

43. The introduction of the euro as the budget and accounting currency of the Convention would be a departure from the United Nations Financial Regulations and Rules. Consequently, it would require detailed review by the United Nations Secretariat as to the feasibility of maintaining records in two currencies within the existing United Nations Integrated Management Information System, including but not limited to technical changes to the system that might be required and the associated costs for such changes. Bearing in mind the decision of the General Assembly, by its resolution 60/283 II, to replace the Integrated Management Information System with a next-generation enterprise resource planning system, any modifications of the Integrated Management Information System at the present time with the United Nations to accommodate a single operation, would bring marginal benefits for the effort involved, as well as result in potentially very significant financial implications.

44. The General Assembly might wish to note that the decision of the Conference of the Parties on the introduction of the euro as the budget and accounting

* The delegation of Bangladesh subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

currency from 2008-2009, while not amending the general principles of the current institutional linkage and related administrative arrangements approved by General Assembly resolution 60/201, and assuming that it was feasible for the Secretariat to maintain separate administrative arrangements, would result in a substantial increase in the scope and costs of reimbursable services provided to the Convention.

45. In section VI of resolution 45/248 B, the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

46. **Mr. Fonseca** (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson, recommended that the Committee should adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

47. **Ms. Soto** (Costa Rica), speaking in her capacity as facilitator, drew Committee members' attention to a number of minor drafting changes in the text of the draft resolution.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.55 was adopted with minor drafting changes.*

49. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.31 was withdrawn.*

(f) Convention on Biological Diversity (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.29/Rev.1, L.33 and L.61)

Draft resolution on the International Year of Biodiversity, 2010

50. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.29/Rev.1, which had no programme budget implications.

51. **Mr. Fonseca** (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson, said that the entire fifth preambular paragraph should be replaced with the phrase "Further recalling the 2005 World Summit Outcome" and a footnote referring to General Assembly resolution 60/1 should be added. He also drew attention to a number of minor drafting changes.

52. He also announced that Croatia, Cyprus, Monaco, Palau, Portugal, San Marino, Switzerland and Turkey had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

53. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.29/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution on the Convention on Biological Diversity

54. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.61, which was being submitted by Mr. Fonseca (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.33. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

55. **Mr. Hunte** (Antigua and Barbuda) said that in the sixth preambular paragraph, the phrase "and the decline in ecosystem services" should be deleted. In paragraph 7, the words "to Genetic Resources" should be deleted. He drew attention to a few other minor drafting changes.

56. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.61, as orally revised, was adopted.*

57. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.33 was withdrawn.*

(g) Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its ninth special session (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.19 and L.68)

Draft resolution on the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its ninth special session

58. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.68, which was being submitted by Mr. Fonseca (Brazil), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.19.

59. **Ms. Pliner** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the activities called for in paragraphs 9 and 11 of the draft resolution would not entail any additional appropriation, as they could be absorbed within section 14, United Nations Environment Programme, and section 28G, United Nations Office at Nairobi, of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. Requirements for the biennium 2008-2009 would be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for that biennium.

60. She drew the Committee's attention to section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B, which reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters

and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

61. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.68 was adopted.*

62. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.19 was withdrawn*

Agenda item 55: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.15 and L.69)

Draft resolution on the role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence

63. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.69, which was being submitted by Mr. Barry (Senegal), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.15. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

64. **Mr. Barry** (Senegal), Vice-Chairperson, said that, in paragraph 1, the phrase "on the role of innovation, science and technology in pursuing development in the context of globalization" should be deleted.

65. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.69, as orally revised, was adopted.*

66. **Ms. Fernández** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Moldova, said that globalization should be jointly harnessed by all Governments in order to best take advantage of it and reap its benefits for all. A discussion on globalization and interdependence should therefore reflect all aspects of the phenomenon. Singling out one theme did not add value to the discussion. The related report of the Secretary-General already gave a very narrow view of the issues addressed in the resolution agreed at the previous session. At the level of the United Nations, the developments, challenges and opportunities relating to globalization should be discussed with an open spirit and the broadest possible scope.

67. The European Union was committed to supporting developing countries in addressing the challenges and reaping further the benefits of globalization. As stated in the Millennium Declaration, only through broad and sustained efforts to create a shared future, based upon our common humanity in all its diversity, could globalization be made fully inclusive and equitable.

68. The European Union wished to clarify that a compromise formulation on paragraph 22 of the draft resolution had been achieved on the understanding that the discussion on globalization and interdependence at the next session would focus on the benefits and challenges of globalization alike. The resolution itself rightly reflected both aspects. The European Union was confident that the Secretary-General would avoid espousing theories that interpreted multilateral rules as inimical to development. In that regard, the European Union expected the Secretary-General's report to the sixty-second session to take account of the full range of commitments, policies and processes, whether national, regional or international, that might influence the implementation of national development strategies. International commitments to good governance and countries' primary responsibility for their own development should underpin that analysis. Good governance was one of the key factors having a positive impact on national development strategies.

69. Lastly, the European Union hoped that, in future, the item could be addressed on a biennial basis.

70. **Mr. Meurs** (United States of America) also expressed the hope that, at its next session, the General Assembly would recognize that globalization and interdependence was more appropriate as a biennial item, particularly in view of the work involved in producing the themed report and efforts to streamline United Nations operations. The Committee had been discussing the broad issues raised under the inherently general topic of globalization for many years now. The consideration of specific topics was an admission that that discussion had reached certain limits. All the Committee's resolutions addressed specific aspects of globalization, making a themed globalization resolution redundant. In order to restore value to the Committee's discussion of globalization, while at the same time reducing its workload, he strongly encouraged delegations to support making the item a biennial one at the next session.

71. **Ms. Brown** (Canada), speaking on behalf of the CANZ group of countries (Australia, Canada and New Zealand), endorsed the suggestion that the item should

be considered on a biennial basis and shared the position outlined by the European Union regarding paragraph 22 of the resolution.

72. **Mr. Le Roux** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, and with reference to the discussion on paragraph 22, said that good governance was extremely important for all Governments, both developed and developing. However, the international community needed to realize that the global economic, financial and trading regimes were not equal, but balanced in favour of developed countries. The theme mentioned in paragraph 22 had been chosen to promote understanding that even a developing country with the best governance and the soundest economic policies was still contingent on what happened at the international level. The fact that international rules impacted directly on developing countries needed to be discussed. If poverty was to be eradicated and the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals, attained, there must be an equitable global regime offering equal opportunities to all.

73. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.15 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 56: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(b) Specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of landlocked developing countries: outcome of the International Ministerial Conference of Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries and Donor Countries and International Financial and Development Institutions on Transit Transport Cooperation (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.35 and L.62)

Draft resolution on specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of landlocked developing countries: outcome of the International Ministerial Conference of Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries and Donor Countries and International Financial and Development Institutions on Transit Transport Cooperation

74. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.62, which was being submitted by Mr. Atiyanto (Indonesia), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.35.

75. **Ms. Pliner** (Secretary of the Committee) read out the statement of programme budget implications arising from draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.62, which was also being circulated to the members of the Committee at the meeting.

76. Pursuant to paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, it was envisaged that the midterm review meeting of the Almaty Programme of Action would be held as part of the plenary session of the General Assembly. Provision for conference servicing costs for the sixty-third session of the General Assembly would be included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Any preparatory arrangements, as necessary, for the review would be coordinated by the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States, and carried out through existing mechanisms. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.62 would not give rise to financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

77. In section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B, the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

78. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia), Vice-Chairperson, recommended that the Committee should adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

79. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.62 was adopted.*

80. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.35 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 57: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.22 and L.66)

Draft resolution on the implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006)

81. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.66, which was being submitted by Mr. Atiyanto (Indonesia), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held

on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.22. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

82. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia),Vice-Chairperson, said that the eradication of poverty should be addressed with a sense of urgency and recommended that the Committee should adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

83. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.66 was adopted.*

84. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.22 was withdrawn.*

(b) Industrial development cooperation (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.40 and L.65)

Dr ift resolution on industrial development cooperation

85. **The Chairperson** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.65, which was being submitted by Mr. Atiyanto (Indonesia), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.40. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

86. **Ms. Quintavalle** (Italy), speaking in her capacity as facilitator, drew Committee members' attention to a number of minor drafting changes in the text.

87. **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia), Vice-Chairperson, recommended that the Committee should adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

88. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.65 was adopted with minor drafting changes.*

89. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.40 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 69: Strengthening of the coordination of humanitarian and disaster relief assistance of the United Nations, including special economic assistance (*continued*)

(b) Special economic assistance to individual countries or regions (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.43)

Draft resolution on special economic assistance to Côte d'Ivoire

90. **The Chairperson** informed the Committee that the main sponsors wished to withdraw draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.43.

91. **Mr. Boureima** (Niger), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the African Group had shown all possible flexibility in order to reach a consensus on the draft resolution. Unfortunately, it appeared that certain delegations considered the recent dumping of toxic waste in and around Abidjan a natural rather than a man-made disaster. The African Group reserved the right to draw the attention of the international community, at an appropriate time in the future, to the criminal practice of dumping toxic wastes in developing countries.

92. *Draft resolution A/C.2/61/L.43 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 110: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.2/61/L.59)

Draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the sixty-second session of the General Assembly submitted by the Chairperson

93. **The Chairperson** drew attention to the Committee's draft programme of work for the sixty-second session of the General Assembly (A/C.2/61/L.59).

94. **Ms. Pliner** (Secretary of the Committee) said that agenda item 9 (a) should read "Implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006)".

95. **Mr. Ainchil** (Argentina) said that the General Assembly was currently examining an omnibus resolution whereby all sub-items under agenda item 12 would be considered by the plenary rather than the Second Committee. He therefore wished to know what steps should be taken.

96. **Ms. Pliner** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the draft before the General Assembly had not yet been adopted. The programme of work contained in document A/C.2/61/L.59 would thus be submitted as a recommendation of the Second Committee, which the General Assembly could then revise if necessary. The Office of Legal Affairs had been consulted in that regard.

97. *The draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the sixty-second session of the General Assembly submitted by the Chairperson, as orally amended, was adopted.*

Completion of the main part of the Committee's work

98. **The Chairperson**, in her closing remarks, said that the Committee had sent a strong message that the international community remained committed to the

global partnership for development. She noted, in particular, the decision to hold the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus in Doha in 2008. However, some issues had proved divisive. The Committee had not managed to reach consensus on the trade and development resolution for the third year in a row, or on a resolution on climate change. She appealed to the Committee not to let that practice become a norm and to maintain its record for consensus-building in all its work in the future.

99. **Mr. Ocampo** (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that the draft resolutions adopted by the Committee constituted significant contributions to the advancement of the United Nations development agenda, including the Millennium Development Goals.

100. Poverty eradication remained the most urgent global goal in the development agenda. In its resolution, the Committee had requested the Secretary-General to submit a comprehensive report evaluating the impact of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty and recommending how to take forward the Organization's work on that front.

101. Reaching the Goals remained a formidable challenge for many least developed countries. In that regard, the Declaration issued at the High-level Meeting on the Midterm Comprehensive Global Review of the Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries and the Committee's resolution should help advance the timely and effective implementation of the Programme of Action.

102. With respect to international migration and development, he welcomed the forthcoming Global Forum on Migration and Development as an instrument to advance all countries' engagement in developing strategies to improve the outcomes of international migration for all.

103. In the field of development finance, the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus in Doha, Qatar, in 2008, would provide an important opportunity to assess progress, identify obstacles and agree on actions to overcome them.

104. The resolution on the international financial system and development stressed the importance of an early agreement on a credible and time-bound package of quota and voice reforms in the International Monetary Fund. Some progress had already been made and it was hoped that the Bretton Woods institutions would be able to report further steps on the issue at the Special High-level Meeting of the Economic and Social Council in April 2007.

105. With respect to globalization and interdependence, the Committee had endorsed several of the recommendations put forward in the Secretary-General's report, which had focused on science and technology (A/61/286). However, it should be noted that the resolution did not mention South-South cooperation, despite its critical importance in promoting science and technology. In that connection, however, he welcomed the upgrading of the status of the Third World Network of Scientific Organizations to the Consortium of Science, Technology and Innovation. It was also encouraging that the Committee had been able to agree on a topical theme for the globalization report to be submitted at the sixty-second session of the General Assembly, namely, the linkages between national and international policies.

106. One area in which the Committee's deliberations had not produced the desired results was trade. The lack of consensus on the trade and development resolution was symptomatic of the growing gap between negotiating partners and it was vital that they should redouble their efforts to build bridges and ensure the timely and successful conclusion of the Doha Round.

107. Four key messages had emerged from the informal thematic debate on "Partnerships towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals" and the International Forum on the Eradication of Poverty: good intentions needed to be matched by concrete action; low-cost, low-tech, high-impact interventions to fight the calamities of the poorest were readily available; there was an urgent need for scaling up and; greater efforts were needed to fully tap the potential of civil society and the private sector, particularly through global and national partnerships.

108. With regard to the implementation of the United Nations development agenda, a crucial achievement was the adoption by the General Assembly of a resolution on the Economic and Social Council that

gave the Council two new functions: the annual ministerial reviews and the Development Cooperation Forum. The reviews could help maintain the focus on implementation by serving as a platform for political engagement and as a mechanism for continuous assessment of progress on the United Nations development agenda while the Development Cooperation Forum was expected to enhance the effectiveness of the Council's monitoring of the global development cooperation system and bring the discussion on aid effectiveness to a truly multilateral arena.

109. **Mr. Rosengren** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union shared the Chairperson's concern that the Committee should maintain and strengthen its record for consensus-building.

110. **Mr. Mally** (United States of America) said that his delegation regretted that the Committee had been unable to send a unified message to provide the appropriate political impetus for restarting the Doha Round and for furthering global trade liberalization.

111. **Ms. Brown** (Canada), speaking on behalf of CANZ (Australia, Canada and New Zealand), expressed regret that the Committee had not reached consensus in all instances. The CANZ Group remained confident, however, that all delegations would renew their efforts to maintain the Second Committee's practice of consensus-building at future sessions.

112. After the customary exchange of courtesies, in which **Mr. Rosengren** (Finland) on behalf of the European Union, **Mr. Le Roux** (South Africa) on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, **Ms. Zubčević** (Croatia), **Mr. Mally** (United States of America), **Mr. Fonseca** (Brazil), **Mr. Torrington** (Guyana) on behalf of the Rio Group and the Caribbean Community, **Ms. Brown** (Canada) and **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia) participated, the **Chairperson** declared that the Committee had completed the main part of its work for the sixty-first session.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.